

RECEIVED

0156

SEP 05 2001

~~550702~~

330020

9 MS. NAVIS: My name is Irene Navis. I am  
10 Planning Manager with the Clark County Department of  
11 Comprehensive Planning. You've already heard from two  
12 of our commissioners that Clark County is opposed to  
13 the repository at Yucca Mountain. Since they had  
14 limited time to speak, I wanted to address some of the  
15 issues they talked about just a little more  
16 specifically.

17 Clark County's 15-year oversight of this  
18 program reveals that despite all of the studies that  
19 have been done at Yucca Mountain, too many unanswered  
20 questions remain, even as a site recommendation appears  
21 imminent. DOE's work to date reveals the following:  
22 Underestimates of the true health and safety risks to  
23 people and environment based on inaccurate population  
24 figures. Inadequate consideration of the full scope of  
25 potential impacts on at least 1.5 million Southern

0157

1 Nevada residents, at least 50 million U.S. residents,  
2 and on the 33 million visitors annually to the  
3 Las Vegas area.

4 Clark County and the State of Nevada are

~~550702~~  
330020

5 currently working on an impact assessment to fill in  
6 these gaps in information. An inadequate assessment of  
7 impacts to minority populations, especially relating to  
8 potential property value reductions and emergency  
9 preparedness. The lack of a final design for  
10 repository.

11 The Department of Energy insists that the  
12 flexibility, that they need flexibility to allow the  
13 design to evolve as needed. Lack of a comprehensive  
14 national study of transportation impacts. The  
15 Department of Energy characterizes transportation as a  
16 local problem. And insists on addressing this only  
17 after the site recommendation.

18 There's no actual fully tested waste package.  
19 The proposed casks are merely computer models, yet we  
20 are expected to trust that these containers are safe,  
21 though they have never been built, let alone physically  
22 tested.

23 Ongoing tests at Yucca Mountain. Many of  
24 these tests will not be completed and are not even  
25 required to be completed prior to site recommendation,  
0158

1 or even at the time of license application to the NRC,

2 which could take up to four years to complete.

~~550702~~

3 For these reasons, we urge the Secretary of

330020

4 Energy to grant a minimum 60-day extension for the PSSE

5 review. This will provide an opportunity to urge the

6 Department of Energy to not only follow one consistent

7 final set of rules, but to also recognize and address

8 critical unanswered questions to the satisfaction of

9 the scientific community, oversight agencies, and most

10 importantly, the public, prior to site recommendation.

11 Thank you.